

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ROBERT DERECK LURCH JR.,

Plaintiff,

-against-

COUNTY OF ATLANTIC, et al.,

Defendants.

21-CV-10452 (LTS)

TRANSFER ORDER

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is detained at the Atlantic County Justice Facility (“ACJF”) in Mays Landing, New Jersey, brings this *pro se* action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He alleges that Defendants violated his rights at the ACJF. For the following reasons, this action is transferred to the United States District Court for the New Jersey.

DISCUSSION

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), a civil action may be brought in

(1) a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

Under § 1391(c), a “natural person” resides in the district where the person is domiciled, and an “entity with the capacity to sue and be sued” resides in any judicial district where it is subject to personal jurisdiction with respect to the civil action in question. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(1), (2).

Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated his rights at the ACJF, which is located in New Jersey. Because Plaintiff does not allege that any defendant resides in this district or that a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to his claim arose in this district, venue is

not proper in this Court under § 1391(b). Plaintiff's claims arose in Mays Landing, New Jersey, which is in the District of New Jersey. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 110. Accordingly, venue lies in the District of New Jersey, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), and this action is transferred to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

CONCLUSION

The Clerk of Court is directed to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey. Whether Plaintiff should be permitted to proceed further without prepayment of fees is a determination to be made by the transferee court. A summons shall not issue from this Court. This order closes this case.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of an appeal.¹ *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this order to Plaintiff and note service on the docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 10, 2021
New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN
Chief United States District Judge

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff is barred under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) from filing an action *in forma pauperis* (IFP) while he is a prisoner. *See Lurch v. Bernal*, No. 20-CV-9329 (CM) (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 21, 2020). Plaintiff did not submit an IFP application or pay the filing fees. Whether he may proceed with this action is a determination left to the transferee court.